

1. Heard. The only ground on which the petition for review of the judgment dated 11th October, 2006 has been filed is that in Paragraph 15 of the judgment, it has been observed that "undoubtedly, the impugned order does not disclose elaborate reasonings in support of the conclusions arrived at but it cannot be heard to say that the impugned order does not

disclose any reasoning for the conclusions arrived at." With reference to the said observations, it is submitted that since the order which was sought to be impugned before this Court undisputedly did not disclose elaborate reasonings, it could have been appropriate for the Court to remit the matter before the lower Court to give fair opportunity to both the parties to lead evidence and for reappraisal of the contentions of the parties based on whatever materials placed before it.

2. It is settled law that the review can be only on the ground when there is an error apparent on the face of record or for similar reason. Merely because another view is possible in the facts and circumstances of the matter, that cannot be a ground for review of the order. Undoubtedly, in cases where the order, which is sought to be impugned, does not disclose reasonings for the conclusions which have been arrived at, higher Court in its discretion can remand the matter to the lower court. However, when the conclusions arrived at are found to be correct, merely because the impugned order did not disclose appropriate reasonings in support of such conclusions, that could not be a ground for review of the appellate Court's order.

3. Considering the above observations, therefore, we do not see any error apparent on the face of record in our judgment dated 11th October, 2006. The petition for review of the said judgment is, therefore, rejected.

(R.M.S.KHANDEPARKAR, J)

(V.M.KANADE, J)